

REMARKS

The present communication is in response to the Official Action mailed November 30, 2006. A petition for a two-month extension of the term for response to said Official Action, to and including April 30, 2007, is transmitted herewith.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Owens* (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,630) in view of *Christy* (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,554). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

A feature of the present invention can be generally stated as a message translator which performs message translation functions when no rules are provided for processing the message. Thus, as explained at page 39, line 28 to page 40, line 5, and shown in FIGS. 5 and 6 of the present application, a message translator may execute a message translation function when no rules are provided for message processing of the message. The message translation function may include checking sentence construction of the message and performing translation of the message. Thus, the message may be processed in the absence of business rules.

Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21-25 recite this message translation feature. That is, when no rules are provided for processing the message, the message translation feature may check sentence construction of the message and perform translation of the message.

The Examiner concedes that *Owens* does not specifically teach the feature of checking sentence construction of the message and performing translation of the message. The Examiner goes on to state that *Owens* does provide rules which may be

applied to the various messages (i.e., no forwarding, merely keep message in mailbox) (col. 12, lines 1-2). The Examiner goes on to assert that *Christy* is analogous art and that it discloses another information processing apparatus which provides translation of an e-mail into a recipient's native language based on linguistic construction of the message (i.e., sentence construction) (abstract; col. 2, lines 48-67). The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of *Owens* with *Christy* in order to allow users of multiple languages to communicate with one another, without worrying about the language barrier between the users as supported by *Christy* (col. 2, lines 20-25).

Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

First, applicants respectfully submit that *Owens* does process each message according to rules. A closer look at the passage of *Owens* pointed to by the Examiner reveals that *Owens* applies rules to all messages (col. 11, line 60 to col. 12, line 2):

Referring to FIG. 8, when an e-mail message is received, the receiver has several immediate filter and forward options based on who sent the message (as determined by the originator's e-mail address.) Additional rules include keyword searches on subjects and priority/high importance messages: No forwarding--hold the e-mail message in the computer access message repository for later on-line dial-in. (Emphasis added)

Thus, *Owens* applies rules to all messages. Indeed, *Owens* applies rules to messages even if that rule is to not forward the message or merely keep the message in a mailbox. Such actions amount to processing the messages according to pre-defined rules. In contrast, in the present invention, the method includes processing the message when no rules are provided for the message. Such a feature of the present

invention is not disclosed in the portion of *Owens* relied on by the Examiner.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Christy* fails to teach translating a message when no rules are provided for the message as in the present invention. *Christy* describes translating messages, for example, as in e-mails, from one language into another language. It appears that *Christy* always performs such translation independently of any rules. Indeed, *Christy* is silent regarding translating a message when no rules are provided by the message as in the present invention.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that *Christy* fails to teach checking sentence construction of the message and message translation as in the present invention. *Christy* deals with substituting linguistic units in one language for linguistic units in another language which involves direct lookup between entries of a reference sentence and corresponding entries in one or more target languages (Abstract of *Christy*). Such techniques are not the same as checking sentence construction as in the present invention.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that even if *Christy* did teach checking sentence construction, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify *Owens* with *Christy* for at least the following reasons. *Owens* is directed to techniques for integrating different communication mediums such as electronic mail, voice mail and fax into a universal mailbox (Abstract of *Owens*). Message receivers can access their messages regardless of the message medium used by the sender. *Owens* solves a problem in the art by providing the receiver with different means of accessing messages. *Owens* makes no mention of translating the messages or checking sentence construction. In fact, the teachings of *Owens* impliedly teach away from translating messages as taught by *Christy*. For example, *Owens* processes voice mail messages which are stored as voice data and

thus not compatible with the translation techniques of *Christy*. Likewise, fax messages are stored as non-text data which are not compatible with the translation of *Christy* or with sentence checking techniques in general. In other words, voice mail and fax messages are not compatible with sentence checking and are best suited to be sent to the receiver without translation. Indeed, voice mail and fax messages are in a format which prevents translating or checking the sentence construction of the message. One skilled in the art reading *Owens* would not be motivated to modify *Owens* with the translating techniques of *Christy* or with checking sentence construction techniques in general. In fact, one skilled in the art would be discouraged from adding further processing functionality to the techniques of *Owens*.

Furthermore, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify *Owens* with *Christy* for the following additional reasons. The present invention deals with problems different than those in *Owens* and *Christy* and thus there would be no reason to look to *Owens* or *Christy* or combine the teachings of *Owens* and *Christy*. In other words, *Christy* and *Owens* are not analogous art with the present invention. For example, *Owens* relates to integrating various communication mediums into a universal mailbox. *Christy* deals with translating one language to another language. In contrast, the present invention deals with handling transactions from different parties according to business rules. Thus, one skilled in the art would not look to *Christy* or *Owens* when considering the present invention.

Thus, for at least these reasons, it would not have been obvious to modify *Owens* with *Christy*. To conclude otherwise would amount to hindsight reconstruction which is strictly prohibited. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited by claims 1-2, 5, 7-12,

14-19 and 21-25 is patentable over *Owens* in view of *Christy* for at least the above reasons.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 13 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Owens* in view of *Matsuo*, U.S. Patent No. 5,634,005 (hereinafter "*Matsuo*").

Claims 6, 13 and 20 depend from claims 1, 8 and 15 respectively, which independent claims are thought to be patentably distinct over *Owens* for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner appears to only rely on *Matsuo* for disclosing features of dependent claims 6, 13 and 20. It is respectfully submitted that the portions of *Matsuo* relied upon by the Examiner do not appear to overcome the deficiencies of *Owens* relating to the message translation features recited in the amended independent claims.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met by the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.


Application No.: 10/008,443

Docket No.: SONYSH 3.0-1257

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Arthur S. Ortega
Registration No.: 53,422
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicants

751831_1.DOC